SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 16 1971

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

No. 1089

LEONARD DUNCAN, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

HAROLD CRANSTON, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

REPLY OF PETITIONERS TO THE BRIEFS IN OPPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS HAROLD CRANSTON, ET AL., ALBERT GULIAN, ET AL., AND CLIFFORD HARDIN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

EDWARD J. RYAN
JOHN J. SIMARD
1334 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Attorneys for Petitioners.

February 13, 1971

THE CASILLAS PRESS, INC.—1717 K Street, N. W.—Washington, D. C.—223-1220

INDEX

		Page
I.	THE RESPONDENTS' BRIEFS IN OPPOSITION TOTALLY FAIL TO RESPOND TO THE FACTS AND ISSUES SET FORTH IN THE PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.	1
	1. The First Question Posed By Petitioners Pertaining To Control And Collusion Involves A Question of Law, And The Findings Of The District Court Are Not Only Clearly Erroneous In Any Event But Also Procedurally Defective.	1
	2. The Petitioners' Second Question Raises Not Only Substantial Questions Concerning Class Actions But Also Regarding Due Process And A Departure From Accepted And Normal Judicial Procedure.	14
	3. The Petitioners' Third Question Concerning Eligiblity Of Private Respondents' Counsel To Apply For Fees From The Escrow Fund Is Ripe For Review Because Such Application Was Erroneously Authorized By The Lower Court's Decision. . . .	19
	4. The Petitioners' Fourth Question Concerning Continuation of Escrowing And The Rewriting And Extending Of The Illegal Differential Is Overly Ripe For Review, And The Lower Court Erred In Not Directing The Immediate Termination Of The Illegal Differential And The Escrowing Thereunder.	20
II.	THE PRIVATE RESPONDENTS' TACTIC AND REPRESENTATIONS IN PERSONALLY ATTACKING PETITIONERS AND THEIR COUNSEL ARE NOT ONLY IMPROPER AND FALSE BUT MAY ALSO DISSUADE THE BAR FROM EXPOSING FRAUD AND COLLUSION.	22

Page

III. CONCLUSION 28

APPENDIX A — Additional Excerpts From Collusion Hearing and Recorded Telephone Conservation Between Plaintiff Cranston And Attorney Charles Ryan A-1

1. Excerpts From Testimony Of Witness Herrington A-1

2. Additional Excerpts From Recorded Conversation Between Plaintiff Cranston and Attorney Ryan Re Control of Cranston Case, etc. . . . A-2

APPENDIX B — Letter From F.B.I. Director Hoover Denying Acquaintanceship With Cranton's Attorney B-1

APPENDIX C — Letter Illustrating Petitioners' Difficulty In Obtaining Record For Review Or Appeals C-1

1. Letter from Clerk, U.S. District Court, Informing Of Inability to Transmit Record For Appeal Because Located In Another District . . . C-1

2. Letter from Congressman to USDA Illustrating When And How Petitioners Examined Cranston Record . . . C-2

APPENDIX D — List Of Petitioners In Lower Court And In This Court D-1

APPENDIX E — Illustrative Commendations Received By Petitioners' Former Attorney To Rebut Respondents' Vilification E-1

1. Letter From Northern Farms Cooperative, Inc., to Attorney Ryan E-1

2. Letter From Governor of Vermont to Attorney Ryan E-2

Page

3. News Article In Vermont Newspaper Concerning Testimonial Dinner E-3

4. News Article In National Farmers Organization Newspaper Concerning Attorney Ryan E-4

CITATIONS

Cases:

Blair, et al. v. Freeman,
370 F.2d 229 (1966) 6, 9, 12, 21

Gardner v. Goodyear,
131 U.S. Appendix ciii 3, 9

Graver Mfg. Co. v. Linde Co.,
167 F.2d 538, 336 U.S. 275 10

Herrington, et al. v. Freeman,
Civil Action No. 2861, USDC, DC 6, 7, 11, 12 15-18, 28

Mathies v. Seymour Mfg. Co.,
270 F.2d 365 23

San Francisco v. Boyd,
140 P.2d 660 9

United States v. Johnson,
319 U.S. 302 (1943) 8-9

Zuber v. Allen,
396 U.S. 168 (1969) 6, 7 9-14, 18-23

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

No. 1089

LEONARD DUNCAN, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

HAROLD CRANSTON, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

REPLY OF PETITIONERS TO THE BRIEFS IN OPPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS HAROLD CRANSTON, ET AL., ALBERT GULIAN, ET AL., AND CLIFFORD HARDIN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

I. THE RESPONDENTS' BRIEFS IN OPPOSITION TOTALLY FAIL TO RESPOND TO THE FACTS AND ISSUES SET FORTH IN THE PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

1. The First Question Posed By Petitioners Pertaining To Control And Collusion Involves A Question Of Law, And The Findings Of The District Court Are Not Only Clearly Erroneous In Any Event But Also Procedurally Defective.

The paramount question raised by Petitioners is whether this suit was collusive as a matter of law or as